

Remarks

In the non-final Office Action mailed March 14, 2008 claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, 14-19, 21-22, 24-29, 31 and 33 are pending. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, 14-19, 21-22, 24-29, 31 and 33 have been rejected. The Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 8, 11-12, 16, 19, 22, 24, 26-29, and 31, and have cancelled claims 4, 15, and 25. The Applicants traverse the rejections herein.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 22, 24-29, and 31 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner suggested that the recitation of a "computer readable medium" in claim 22 is merely directed to a signal. The Applicants have amended claims 22, 24, 27-29, and 31. The Applicants have cancelled claim 25. The Applicants submit the claims are directed to statutory subject matter as required by MPEP 2106.01.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-12, 14-15, 19, 21-22, 24-25, 29, 31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0048470 (Garcia). The Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11, 12, and 22 to indicate the generating step is in response to an operating parameter within the printer changing independently of input from an operator, and submit that the amended claims are not anticipated by Garcia.

Amended independent claim 1, paraphrased herein, recites a method for presenting a printer operator interface to a user. According to the method, the printer generates HTTP data including status information about the printer in response to an operating parameter within the printer changing independently of input from the user. The HTTP data is transmitted to a HTTP browser on a remote terminal to provide information about the printer to a remote user. In order to provide status information for the printer to a user at the printer, the HTTP data generated by the printer is interpreted at the printer on a display integral to the printer.

Claim 1 as amended includes the additional limitation recited in rejected dependent claim 4. Amended claim 1 now recites, in part, that the printer "generates HTTP data including status information about the printer in response to an operating parameter within the printer changing independently of input from the user". In rejecting claim 4, the Examiner suggests that Garcia teaches this limitation and refers to paragraphs 24 and 31 of Garcia in the Office Action to

support this suggestion. The Applicants disagree that Garcia teaches this limitation and submit that the Examiner has mischaracterized the indicated paragraphs. Garcia teaches a printer 12 with web browser 23 can access a web page from printer 12 (paragraph 24). Garcia states that this function “is performed independent of control by an associated computer or computer network” (paragraph 24). The Applicants submit that paragraph 24 does not teach or reasonably suggest that the generating step is in response to an operating parameter within the printer changing independently of input from an operator, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

In rejecting claim 4, the Examiner also refers to paragraph 31 of Garcia as teaching the limitations amended into independent claim 1. The Applicants disagree that Garcia teaches or reasonably suggests this limitation.. In paragraph 31, Garcia teaches that web browser 23 includes various display elements including print queue 220, settings 222, toner function 224 and status function 230. The Applicants submit that paragraph 31 does not teach or reasonably suggest that the generating step is in response to an operating parameter within the printer changing independently of input from an operator, as recited in amended independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is novel over Garcia. Claims 11, 12, and 22, which recite analogous limitations as claim 1, are novel for at least the same reasons. Dependent claims 3, 8, 10, 14, 19, 21, 24, 29, 31, and 33 are novel over Garcia at least for depending on allowable base claims 1, 11, 12 and 22.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected dependent claims 5-7, 16-18, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Garcia and U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0196460 (Parry). The Applicants submit that Parry does not alleviate the weakness of Garcia, as discussed for claim 1, in teaching the limitation amended into claims, 1, 11, 15, and 22. The Applicants therefore submit that dependent claims 5-7, 16-18, and 26-28 are non-obvious over the combination of Garcia and Parry for depending on allowable base claims 1, 11, 15, and 22.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10-12, 14, 16-19, 21-22, 24, 26-29, 31 and 33 are novel and non-obvious in view of the cited art, and therefore respectfully request the Examiner allow claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10-12, 14, 16-19, 21-22, 24, 26-29, 31 and 33.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 11, 2008

/Sean J. Varley/

Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397
Duft, Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)